

**WARREN COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SPECIAL MEETING
FRIDAY, JULY 6, 2007**

The Board of Supervisors of the County of Warren convened at the Supervisors' Room in the Warren County Municipal Center, Lake George, New York, at 9:00 a.m.

**NOTICE OF SPECIAL MEETING
TO THE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF
SUPERVISORS OF WARREN COUNTY:**

You are hereby notified that, I, WILLIAM H. THOMAS, Chairman of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Warren, pursuant to the power vested in me by Rule A.3 of the Rules of the Board of Supervisors, hereby call and convene a special meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Warren County to be held in the Supervisors' Room in the Warren County Municipal Center, Town of Queensbury, New York, on Friday, July 6, 2007 at 9:00 a.m., for the purpose of considering, and if determined by the Board to be appropriate, voting on, or otherwise taking action on, the following matter:

1. Authorizing, if appropriate, one (1) or more County office building construction projects; and
2. To conduct such other business as may properly come before the Board of Supervisors.

The Clerk of the Board of Supervisors is hereby directed to call for the meeting and give written notice to all members of the Board of Supervisors of such meeting.

Dated: June 15, 2007

WILLIAM H. THOMAS, CHAIRMAN
Warren County Board of Supervisors

Mr. William Thomas presiding.

Salute to the flag was led by Supervisor Belden.

Roll called, the following members present:

Supervisors Gabriels, Monroe, Girard, Sheehan, Kenny, Belden, Bentley, W. Thomas, Tessier, Merlino, Stec, Caimano, Champagne, VanNess, Sokol, F. Thomas, Haskell, and Geraghty - 18.

Absent: Supervisors Mason and O'Connor - 2.

Chairman Thomas explained that the purpose of the meeting today was to discuss the construction of one or more County office building projects and he further stated that the board members had been reviewing these options for several months. Chairman Thomas turned the meeting over to Supervisor Haskell, Chairman of the County Facilities Committee, and advised that Mr. Haskell would be chairing the remainder of the meeting.

Mr. Haskell introduced John Horgan and Dick White, representing Bovis Lend Lease LMB, Inc., as well as John Martin and Jon Norris, representing Clark Patterson Associates. He extended privilege of the floor to Mr. Horgan, who provided a power point presentation

which outlined the four different building project options for the board members. A copy of the power point presentation is on file with the minutes. Mr. Haskell requested the Supervisors to hold any questions until the presentation was completed.

Mr. Horgan reviewed the power point presentation in detail. He highlighted that Option 1- Westmount Site, had a cost estimate of \$29.6 million. He noted that this was the original site for the proposed project. He reviewed the 'pros' and 'cons' associated with Option 1, as listed in the power point presentation.

Referring to Option 2- Municipal Center Site, Mr. Horgan noted the cost estimate was \$27.6 million. He said that the building would be located on the southern end of the existing Municipal Center Campus. Again, Mr. Horgan reviewed the list of 'pros' and 'cons' associated with Option 2. He advised this would be a three story building.

Mr. Horgan advised Option 3- Two Buildings Using Both Sites, had a cost estimate of \$28.7 million. He noted that with this option, they had tried to combine the 'pros' of Options 1 and 2. He added that the location of the Department of Social Services Building would still need to be determined with this Option. He stated that the building on the Municipal Center Campus would be at the same location as Option 2; however, he said, it would be a much smaller scale, it would only be a two story building.

Continuing, Mr. Horgan stated Option 4- Additional Floor (10,000 sf), had a cost estimate of \$2.15 million. He explained that this option would need to be combined with Option 3 and would add an additional floor consisting of 10,000 square feet of space for future growth needs or space assignments to the proposed new building; thereby making it a three story building.

Mr. O'Connor entered the meeting at 9:10 a.m.

Concluding the power point presentation, Mr. Horgan recapped the cost estimates for each Option that was presented. He noted that Option 3 would be combined with Option 4, giving a total cost estimate of \$30.8 million.

Mr. Haskell thanked Mr. Horgan for his detailed and informative presentation. He stated that due to the ongoing issues regarding court space, he was recommending Option 3 and Option 4 combined, which would alleviate those problems. He further explained that if the board members agreed to these Options, it would allow for the expansion of the District Attorney's Office, as well as the Probation Department. He noted that this Option would also include moving the Department of Social Services to the Municipal Center Campus, which would enable the County to receive a 75% reimbursement for electricity costs, a higher rate than would be offered from the co-generation facility at the Westmount Site. He added that the County also received a 30-36% reimbursement from the Health Services Department, which with this Option, would be re-located to the Westmount Site; therefore, the County would realize a greater savings on the Municipal Center Campus.

Mr. Stec requested an estimate of square footage for each of the options presented. Jon Norris, of Clark Patterson and Associates, said Option 1 had an estimate of 98,000 square feet; Option 2 had an estimate of plus or minus 98,000 square feet; Option 3 had an estimate of 66,000 square feet for the building on the Westmount Site and 37,000 square feet for the building on the Municipal Center Site; and Option 4 was 10,000 square feet to be added on as an additional floor to the building at the Municipal Center Site.

Mr. Caimano expressed his concern with the debt service for whatever option the County chose. He referred to a letter from the County Treasurer, Frank O'Keefe, which outlined what was left in the County surplus as of the 25th of June, in addition to payments for the upcoming year that the County was responsible for. He said the County needed to build within their means. He added that if the County took the interest rates on the bonds, they could then determine what they could afford, keeping under the cap of what could be spent on debt service in 2008 and 2009.

Mr. Girard said that the square footage needed for the new building totaled 100,000 square feet and that number was derived from the numerous meetings held with each department within the County. He questioned if Mr. Caimano wanted the square footage reduced in order to cut the cost of the project. Mr. Caimano responded that a private corporation located next to the County Center was beginning to build a 66,000 square foot building, with essentially the same number of employees. Mr. Haskell added that was correct; however, he said, that corporation did not require the confidentiality space that all of the County departments needed. Mr. Caimano replied it was approximately a \$13 million difference between the private corporation building and the buildings being proposed for the County. Mr. Haskell noted that in terms of dollars, the private corporation did not have to pay prevailing wage rate, as the County did; therefore, he felt a comparison between the two buildings could not be made.

Mr. Kenny stated he appreciated all the efforts of Mr. Haskell, Clark Patterson and Associates, Bovis Lend Lease and the County Facilities Committee in preparing the four options presented to the board members today. He advised that he had been doing some research on his own and discovered some startling numbers that he wanted to share. He said that Rutgers had done a report which stated that twenty years ago, companies calculated 227 square feet per employee and today that number was closer to 175 square feet per employee. He referred to the GSA (General Services Administration) and the standard for all federal buildings that required confidentiality was 200 square feet per employee. He further stated that the plans before the board members today showed that 250 County employees would be going into a 100,000 square foot building, totaling approximately 400 square feet per employee. Mr. Kenny listed the square footage, not including common areas, outlined in the plans for the following departments: Department of Social Services, 319 workable square feet per employee; Health Services, 210 square feet per employee; Office for the Aging, 255 square feet per employee; WIC (Women, Infant and Children) 455 square feet per employee; Youth Bureau, 220-330 square feet per employee; Youth Advocacy Program, 190 square feet per employee; Veterans Services, 355 square feet per employee; Council for Prevention, 4,200 square feet total; One Stop Center, including Department of Labor and Employment and

Training, 9,500 square feet total. He added that agreements had not been made guaranteeing that the Council for Prevention, the Youth Advocacy Program and the One Stop Center would even join the new building and the County had not even determined what they would charge those departments for rent if they did. He concluded that he could not vote in favor of a \$30 million building project.

Mr. Mason entered the meeting at 9:35 a.m.

Mr. Stec commented that the research presented by Mr. Kenny was very compelling and he questioned if the standards were 200 square feet per employee, or less, then why did these plans reflect significantly more square footage per employee. Mr. Haskell replied that the offices that had 225 square feet were for Directors of the individual departments and included consultation space; all other employees would be in common areas with cubicles.

Mr. Caimano referred to the offices and departments listed by Mr. Kenny that may or may not come to the new building, noting that space totaled 10,000 to 13,000 square feet. He further stated that space alone, if not needed, could substantially reduce the cost of the proposed project.

Mr. Girard expounded that the concerns being expressed today should have come before the board members long before Mr. Haskell and all the parties involved began work on this project. He said it should have been directed that the County could only afford a set amount of square footage for a set price per square footage, prior to all this work. The lack of that direction, he said, continued to make the County digress. Mr. Haskell clarified that letters of intent were received from the outside agencies mentioned earlier, expressing their desire to be included in the new building and that was what these design plans were based on.

Mr. Haskell clarified that he had been directed by the County Facilities Committee to include the outside agencies that were previously mentioned; however, he said, if the board members had changed their minds, a motion could be made to eliminate them.

Mr. Bentley apprised half of the employees at the One Stop Center were County employees, for which the County paid to rent office space. Mr. VanNess added that William Reese, Director of Employment and Training Administration (ETA), had advised that the State would not allow the Department of Labor (DOL) and the ETA to separate; thereby giving the name One Stop Center.

In response to an inquiry from Mr. Tessier, Mr. Haskell replied that the County spent over \$85,000 annually to rent office space at the Northway Plaza (One Stop Center) and the CNA Building.

Mr. Mason recalled that Mr. Haskell had done comprehensive studies on the square footage needs of every department that would be included in the new building and then made substantial cuts to that. Mr. Haskell said that was correct and added they had cut back the square footage to what they thought would be the least amount of space for an efficient

operation. He added that the only extra space included in the design plans were for the outside agencies that the County was currently paying rent for to be located off campus.

Fred Austin, Building Projects Coordinator, commented that the board members needed to keep in mind that the Department of Social Services (DSS) had over 40,000 visitors a year that went through that building, which when broken down was a total of 170 visitors per day that required space. He added that the design plans for the employees in the DSS building were comprised of cubicles, which were two sizes, sixty-six square feet and the majority of which were fifty-four square feet.

Mr. Monroe made a motion to not include any outside agencies in the design plans for the new building, but to include the additional 10,000 square feet in order to accommodate the courts in the existing Municipal Center building. Mr. VanNess seconded the motion for discussion.

Mr. Haskell stated that the additional 10,000 square feet would not be needed if the outside agencies were not included. Mr. Monroe said he did not think that it made sense to pay \$300 a square foot to build space for outside agencies. Mr. Haskell added that when they included those outside agencies, the plan was to phase them out over the next thirty years to allow for the County's growth. Mr. Norris agreed, it noted that they had situated them within the building such that if departments grew that were County related, they could assume the square footage. Mr. Haskell concluded that by eliminating the outside agencies, future growth within the County would be eliminated, as well.

Mr. Mason advised the premise of the new building was to have all County employees under one roof for the convenience of the citizens. Mr. Kenny clarified the outside agencies were the Youth Advocacy Program, the Council for Prevention and the One Stop Center (Department of Labor) and the total square footage to accommodate those agencies was 15,000 square feet, a cost of \$4.5 million.

Mr. Stec requested a roll call vote on Mr. Monroe's motion. Mr. Champagne noted that he felt with regard to the One Stop Center, the DOT and the ETA needed to stay together.

Prior to the roll call vote, Mrs. Sady advised a motion to waive the rules of the board was necessary. Motion was made by Mr. Stec, seconded by Mr. Caimano and carried unanimously to waive the rules of the board requiring a resolution be in writing.

Pursuant to the roll call vote, the motion to not include any outside agencies in the design plans for the new building, but to include the additional 10,000 square feet in order to accommodate the courts in the existing Municipal Center building failed by majority vote.

Mr. Haskell clarified the board members just approved including the outside agencies in the new building. Mr. Tessier asked Mr. Haskell what Option he was recommending and Mr. Haskell replied he would recommend proceeding with Options 3 and 4 as presented.

Motion was made by Mr. Haskell and seconded by Mr. Girard to approve Options 3 and 4 as presented to the board members.

Mr. Gabriels questioned if Mr. Haskell was recommending Option 4 as an alternative

or as a fixed item included in the plan. Mr. White explained they were recommending that Option 4 be bid as an alternate at this time, and as the numbers were received the board members could make their decision as to whether or not include the 10,000 square foot additional floor.

Mr. Stec requested a roll call vote on Mr. Haskell's motion. Mr. Gabriels made a motion to table Mr. Haskell's motion. Mr. Stec seconded the motion to table. Mr. Haskell requested a roll call vote on the motion to table.

Pursuant to the roll call vote, the motion to approve Options 3 and 4 was tabled by majority vote.

Chairman Thomas suggested that discussions on this issue come to a close for today and that the square footage currently outlined in the building plans be reviewed and compared to the GSA standards as noted by Mr. Kenny. Mr. Haskell agreed; however, he requested that Mr. Stec, Mr. Caimano, Mr. Champagne and Mr. Kenny sit in on every meeting with regard to the design plans and square footage.

Mr. Stec apprised he would like to see a plan for 200 square feet per employee or a reason why that governmental standard could not be met.

Motion was made by Mr. Stec to direct the consultants to develop a design plan to accommodate County employees with 200 square feet or to provide a detailed explanation as to why that would not be feasible; as well as to appropriate the funds needed to authorize these additional studies. Mr. Kenny seconded the motion.

Mr. O'Connor advised that the standards for square footage presented by Mr. Kenny were actually from studies conducted in 2002. However, he said, he would like that information made available to all the members of the board, as well as the consultants involved with this project. Mr. Haskell agreed and confirmed that everyone would receive copies of the documents that Mr. Kenny had read from.

Mr. Monroe suggested that Mr. Stec include in his motion that the proposed market rent on the space for the outside agencies be included in order to determine how much the County was subsidizing those operations for.

Mr. Stec amended his motion to include the proposed market rent on the space for the outside agencies (Department of Labor, Youth Advocacy Program and the Council for Prevention of Alcohol and Substance Abuse) be included in order to determine how much the County was subsidizing those operations for. Mr. Kenny seconded the amended motion.

Mr. Haskell requested a roll call vote on the aforementioned motion. Mrs. Sady noted a motion was needed to waive the rules of the board. Motion was made by Mr. Caimano, seconded by Mr. Stec and carried unanimously to waive the rules of the board requiring a resolution be in writing.

Following the roll call vote, the motion was carried by majority vote to authorize Clark Patterson and Associates to reduce the office space to 200 square feet per employee or to provide a justification for the 400 square feet per employee and to include the proposed market rent on the space for the outside agencies (Department of Labor, Youth Advocacy Program and the Council for Prevention of Alcohol and Substance Abuse) in order to determine how much the County was subsidizing those operations for; and to authorize funding for the additional work to Clark Patterson and Associates for an amount not to exceed \$10,000. Mr. Haskell voted in opposition.

Mr. Monroe apprised that there was a time when the Family Court, County Court and Supreme Court were truly operated by the County. However, he said, now the Office of Court Administration dictated the operations of the courts, and were moving towards consolidation of the courts; thereby forming a District Court and abolishment of local Courts. He further stated that it seemed to him that if the State was going to run the courts, then the State Representatives should request the State to pay for the courts. He noted that if the Department of Labor wanted a One Stop, then the State should pay for the One Stop.

Mr. Monroe said this outlined continued unfunded mandates which shifted the tax burden from the income tax at the State level onto the property tax. He noted that this issue should be referred to the Legislative Committee to ask our State Representatives to pursue this in the Legislature. He added it was not right for the State to control these operations and to send the bills to the County.

Motion was made by Mr. Monroe, seconded by Mr. W. Thomas and carried unanimously to refer this issue to the Legislative Committee to propose a proper resolution to our State Legislators requesting legislation at the State level, to have the State pay for what they mandated with regards to the court systems and the Department of Labor.

Chairman Thomas acknowledged Lisa Manzi, representative of Congresswoman Gillibrands' Office, was present and he extended privilege of the floor to Ms. Manzi. Ms. Manzi apprised she had sent out an email to Supervisors regarding wastewater and waterline infrastructure needs and requested town Supervisors who had such needs to contact her for information on federal funding for those types of projects. She noted she also had information that pertained to broadband grants and she could be reached at the Glens Falls Office at 743-1382.

Mr. Caimnao asked Ms. Manzi if she had any updates on the County's request for funding for the Point of Care system and Ms. Manzi replied she did not at this time other than that the appropriation request had been submitted and was on their list of projects.

Mr. Girard extended appreciation on behalf of Bob Landry, Director of the Housing Authority, for the assistance with a waiver to rectify problems that he was experiencing. He added that Mr. Landry had advised that the funding had been reinstated for the Housing Authority.

Chairman Thomas extended privilege of the floor to the public for comments.

Kathleen Sonnabend, resident of the Town of Queensbury, commented she was very pleased with the resolutions that were passed today regarding the new buildings and agreed more information was needed prior to making a final decision.

George Weinscheck, resident of Lake George, thanked Mr. Kenny for the information he brought before the board members today. He questioned where the County would come up with the funding for this project; however, he said, he was pleased that the board members held off on their decision until more information was received.

Peter Brothers, resident of Lake George, said he agreed with the comments that had been made today. He recommended that the board members become more fiscally concerned and conscious of the goals of the County.

Connie Farrington, resident of the Town of Queensbury, thanked the board members for their hard work with regard to this project.

There being no further business, on motion by Mr. Gabriels and seconded by Mr. Monroe, Chairman Thomas adjourned the meeting at 11:28 a.m.